

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>DOMINICK STERN, 690425,</b>	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:07-CV-428-P</b>
	)	<b>ECF</b>
<b>CHRISTINA CRAIN, Chairperson, Texas Board</b>	)	
<b>of Criminal Justice,</b>	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This cause of action was referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b), as implemented by an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. The Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge follow:

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

**I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff is a state inmate. He files this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Defendant is Christina Crain, Chairperson of the Texas Board of Criminal Justice.

On March 19, 2007, the Court sent Plaintiff a notice of deficiency informing him that his civil rights complaint was not on the appropriate form. On March 26, 2007, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint, but did not correct the deficiency of failing to file on the appropriate form. On July 13, 2007, the Court sent Plaintiff a second notice of deficiency regarding the form. The Court informed Plaintiff that failure to cure the deficiency within thirty (30) days could result in a recommendation that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed. More than thirty (30) days have

passed, and Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's order.


## **II. DISCUSSION**

Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998). "This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court's inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases." *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash, R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962)). Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's Order. Accordingly, the complaint should be dismissed for want of prosecution.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court recommends that the District Court dismiss Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice for want of prosecution pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Signed this 19<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007.



---

PAUL D. STICKNEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND  
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

The United States District Clerk shall serve a true copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation on Plaintiff. Pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1), any party who desires to object to these findings, conclusions and recommendation must serve and file written objections within ten days after being served with a copy. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions or recommendation to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusory or general objections. A party's failure to file such written objections to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation shall bar that party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Additionally, any failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation within ten days after being served with a copy shall bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).